that is available to its own directory assistance customers.

- (v) Adjuncts to services. Operator services and directory assistance services must be made available to competing providers in their entirety, including access to any adjunct features (e.g., rating tables or customer information databases) necessary to allow competing providers full use of these services.
- (d) Branding of operator services and directory assistance services. The refusal of a providing local exchange carrier (LEC) to comply with the reasonable request of a competing provider that the providing LEC rebrand its operator services and directory assistance, or remove its brand from such services, creates a presumption that the providing LEC is unlawfully restricting access to its operator services and directory assistance. The providing LEC can rebut this presumption by demonstrating that it lacks the capability to comply with the competing provider's request.
- (e) Disputes—(1) Disputes involving nondiscriminatory access. In disputes involving nondiscriminatory access to operator services, directory assistance services, or directory listings, a providing LEC shall bear the burden of demonstrating with specificity:
- (i) That it is permitting nondiscriminatory access, and
- (ii) That any disparity in access is not caused by factors within its control. "Factors within its control" include, but are not limited to, physical facilities, staffing, the ordering of supplies or equipment, and maintenance.
- (2) Disputes involving unreasonable dialing delay. In disputes between providing local exchange carriers (LECs) and competing providers involving unreasonable dialing delay in the provision of access to operator services and directory assistance, the burden of proof is on the providing LEC to demonstrate with specificity that it is processing the calls of the competing provider's customers on terms equal to that of similar calls from the providing LEC's own customers.

[61 FR 47350, Sept. 6, 1996, as amended at 64 FR 51911, Sept. 27, 1999]

EFFECTIVE DATE NOTE: At 64 FR 51911, Sept. 27, 1999, $\S51.217$ was amended by revising paragraph (c)(3). This paragraph contains

information collection and recordkeeping requirements and will not become effective until approval has been given by the Office of Management and Budget.

§51.219 Access to rights of way.

The rules governing access to rights of way are set forth in part 1, subpart J of this chapter.

§51.221 Reciprocal compensation.

The rules governing reciprocal compensation are set forth in subpart H of this part.

§ 51.223 Application of additional requirements.

- (a) A state may not impose the obligations set forth in section 251(c) of the Act on a LEC that is not classified as an incumbent LEC as defined in section 251(h)(1) of the Act, unless the Commission issues an order declaring that such LECs or classes or categories of LECs should be treated as incumbent LECs.
- (b) A state commission, or any other interested party, may request that the Commission issue an order declaring that a particular LEC be treated as an incumbent LEC, or that a class or category of LECs be treated as incumbent LECs, pursuant to section 251(h)(2) of the Act.

§51.230 Presumption of acceptability for deployment of an advanced services loop technology.

- (a) An advanced services loop technology is presumed acceptable for deployment under any one of the following circumstances, where the technology:
- (1) Complies with existing industry standards; or
- (2) Is approved by an industry standards body, the Commission, or any state commission; or
- (3) Has been successfully deployed by any carrier without significantly degrading the performance of other services
- (b) An incumbent LEC may not deny a carrier's request to deploy a technology that is presumed acceptable for deployment unless the incumbent LEC demonstrates to the relevant state commission that deployment of the particular technology will significantly degrade the performance of